December 14, 1997

TO: Lester Snow, Steve Yaeger, Judy Kelly, CALFED Program Managers

FROM: Mary Selkirk

SUBJECT: Significant Issues Raised at the BDAC Meeting, December 12, 1997

The following is a brief summary of the significant policy issues and information requests raised by BDAC members at their meeting on December 12th. This summary reflects comments raised only in the plenary session. Notes from the three afternoon break-out sessions are being transcribed. These comments were made in the course of discussions on the proposed ERPP refinement process and on the IDT ranking of distinguishing characteristics across the three draft alternatives.

Information Requested for the January BDAC Meeting:

1. How CALFED is assessing projected drinking water standards in modeling the performance of the three alternatives.

2. Storage: advantages/disadvantages of each scenario, effects on the Bay, effects on north and south Delta

3. Discussion of trade-offs between water supply reliability and fisheries improvements

4. Discussion of export water quality versus fisheries improvements

5. Quantification of bar charts and paragraph provided on staff's view of their significance

6. Explicit objectives of the ERPP: the draft conceptual model, including specific outflow/temperature/timing objectives for each fish species

7. Further discussion of demand management program component.

Comments on the ERPP and Information Requested

Comments:
--Conceptual model and quantified goals have to be in the programmatic EIR

-A set of implementation principles should specify exactly where water will come from and for what use

--Need to clarify what will be in the proposed Executive Summary document and what will be contained in the proposed Strategic Plan

--ERPP team should include a watershed scientist, a resource economist, and an environmental planner

E-015958

--CALFED needs to develop a strategic plan now, and the open technical process described needs to be initiated early on

Public Comment:
--All tiers of scientific review and public input proposed should begin simultaneously

--CALFED should define a rigorous review process for all other components of the program, to provide a better understanding of how the CALFED solution will address these components

Information Requested:
--Explanation of exactly where the flows will come from

--"Water balance sheet" needs to be prepared: how much restoration will be accomplished for how much water

--Comparison of current outflow versus proposed CALFED outflows; what are the "water costs" of the ERPP

--What type of conversion of ag lands, how much, and for what type of habitat

Comments on IPT and Information Requested

General Comments:
--It is absolutely clear that the most benefit comes from storage not from conveyance system (BDAC Co-chair)

--It doesn't make sense a this point to rank these alternatives. We need to weight the differences first.

Water Quality:
Comments:
--Difficult to assess consequences of averaging water quality effects
Information Requested:
--More breakdown by year type and between users (SWP, CVP)

--Explanation of how the bars change in critical years

Delta Flow Circulation Patterns:
Comments:
--Results may change if longer set of years used for analysis, over and above '76-- 91

--Objection to characterization of Alternative 3 as "closest to natural conditions"
Staff response: This analysis focuses on direction of flows, not magnitude

Information Requested:
--CALFED needs to look closely at how significant this characteristic really is, e.g. tidal effects are more significant than San Joaquin reverse flows.

BDAC Meeting Significant Issues, p. 3

--Narrow the analysis of effects of flow circulation by individual fish species

--(AM) Propose an alternative configuration of Alternative 2 before comparing to Alternative 3-- please analyze my memo
Staff directed by BDAC Co-chair to do analysis

Analysis of flow circulation in critical years as well as averaging

--Modeling of Alternative 1 with reduction of diversions and more natural flow
Staff response: This analysis is in process

Diversion Effects
Information Requested:
--Clarification of how the more protective standards are assumed

Water Supply Opportunities
Information Requested:
--Show interaction between the graphs

--Show how total storage affects total outflow

Operational Flexibility
Comment:
--Realist daily, what is the state of the art of real-time monitoring?

Cost
Comments:
--Concern about absence of dollar ranges shown

--Water users won't pay the full dollar cost

--CALFED cannot rely on "re-adjusting" in the future if a staged project is proposed.

Assurances
Comments:
--The chart is misleading because the more flexible a system is, the more likely it can provide ways to meet solution principles and to provide assurances. Maybe the chart should be re-labeled "fear of the unknown". Maybe it should be eliminated.

--CALFED correct in characterizing that flexibility swings both ways (operational at one end, assurance at other)

--Most of the state doesn't care about levees, so it is imperative that the common pool be retained.

--How about if we eliminate this graph?

--if we don't protect the levees, we lose a dual system. If we can't meet the solution principles, assurances are meaningless.

--Assurances in Alternative 3 would have to replace the political assurance of the common pool.

E-015960